

REMARKS

The office action of June 1, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Applicants thank Examiners Sharp and Saether for taking time out of their busy schedules to meet with the undersigned and Applicants' representative during an Examiner's Interview on October 24, 2005. In the Examiner Interview, distinctions between the invention and the prior art of record were discussed with a proposed amendment to claim 15.

Rule 83 Objection

Claims 4, 5 and 12 were objected to because they recited a feature not shown in the figures. These claims have been canceled rendering this objection moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Indefiniteness Objection

Claim 6 was objected to as it had two terms that allegedly lacked antecedent basis. Claim 6 has been amended herein and the terms in this claim now have antecedent basis. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejection

The claims have been rejected as being anticipated by Carlson or as being obvious over Carlson alone, or in view of Birkelbach, Breed or Moskovitz. Independent claim 15 has been amended herein to further define over these references. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the currently pending claims.

Independent claim 15, as amended herein, recites in part that the load flank (4) in the front area (4) runs from the external diameter to the core (14) over a bend (15) to a greater flank angle (8). This feature is advantageous and is not disclosed or fairly taught in Carlson. Further,

Application. No.: 10/633,592
Reply to Office Action of May 25, 2005

Birkelbach, Breed, Moskovitz or the other references of record do not fairly teach modification of Carlson to arrive at the invention of independent claim 15. Accordingly, claim 15 and the other claims dependent from claim 15 are similarly allowable. Indication of same in the next official action is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: 11/1/05

By: 

1001 G Street N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 824-3000

Robert S. Katz
Registration No. 36,402